

## REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion and in view of the present amendment, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4-5, 8, 10-11, 14, 16-17, and 20 have been amended. Claims 1-20 are pending and under consideration.

### I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, at pages 2-24, claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Murphy (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,164) in view of Calvert et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0102989) and O'Neil (U.S. Patent No. 6,778,818) and further in view of Gwon et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/203904).

Murphy does not discuss or suggest:

a unit calculating only a distance between the measuring apparatus and the search object;

as recited in claim 1. In other words, the invention of 1 calculates *only* a distance between the measuring apparatus and the search object. As a result, the position of the search object is calculated by solving an equation of circles in which each circle has a radius equal to the calculated distances between each of a plurality of measuring apparatuses and the search object. Since the position of the search object is calculated through such an equation of circles, *only distance information* between each of the measuring apparatuses and the search object is *needed*, thereby speeding up the time that is required for locating the search object. The Examiner states that Murphy discloses a unit calculating only a distance between the measuring apparatus and the search object. However, it is submitted that this is incorrect. Murphy, as relied on by the Examiner, discloses that a tracking unit of a position determining device determines the *direction, range, and bearing* of the search object (Murphy, col. 4, lines 55-60; col. 6, lines 48-50). Murphy does not disclose calculating *only* a distance between the position determining device and the search object. Furthermore, Calvert et al., O'Neil, and Gwon et al. are silent on these features of the invention of claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner address this argument, as it has not been addressed by the Examiner in the two previous responses filed by the Applicant in which it has been put forth.

Furthermore, the Examiner concedes that the combination of Murphy and Calvert et al. does not teach wherein a search range, within which the position of the search object is requested, is determined as a search range in which the request apparatus is located.

Therefore, the combination of Murphy and Calvert et al. does not discuss or suggest:

a unit accepting from the request apparatus a search request for searching the position of the search object, wherein a search range, within which the position of the search object is requested, is determined as a search range in which the request apparatus is centered,

as recited in amended claim 1. The Examiner attempts to make up for this deficiency with O'Neil. However, O'Neil does not discuss or suggest:

a unit accepting from the request apparatus a search request for searching the position of the search object, wherein a search range, within which the position of the search object is requested, is determined as a search range in which the request apparatus is centered,

as recited in amended claim 1. In other words, the invention of claim 1 defines a search range for a search object as a range in which the request apparatus is *centered*. O'Neil, as relied on by the Examiner, discloses using a requesting apparatus, such as a PSAP agent, to determine the location of a 911 caller. O'Neil further discloses that the search range defined by the PSAP uses the 911 *caller location* as the center point of the search radius. Therefore, O'Neil does not provide for the requesting apparatus, in this case the PSAP agent, to be centered within the search range. Furthermore, Gwon et al. is silent on this feature of the invention of claim 1.

Since none of Murphy, Calvert et al., O'Neil, and Gwon et al., alone or in combination, discuss or suggest all of the features of the invention of claim 1, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-3 depend either directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 1, and include all the features of claim 1, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 2-3 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

None of the prior art cited by the Examiner discusses or suggests:

calculating only a distance between each of the plurality of measuring apparatuses and the search object from the response received;

and

wherein a search range, within which the position of the search object is requested, is determined as a search range in which the request apparatus is centered,

as recited in amended claims 8 and 14, so that claims 8 and 14 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9 and 15 depend directly from amended independent claims 8 and 14, respectively, and include all the features of claims 8 and 14, respectively, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 9 and 15 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

None of the prior art cited by the Examiner discusses or suggests:

wherein each of the plurality of measuring apparatuses is mobile and calculates only a distance between each of the plurality of measuring apparatuses and the search object, and the plurality of measuring apparatuses located around the search object cooperate with the service device;

and

wherein a search range, within which the position of the search object is requested, is determined as a search range in which the request apparatus is centered,

as recited in amended claims 4-5, 10-11, and 16-17. Therefore, claims 4-5, 10-11, and 16-17 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 6-7, 12-13, and 18-19 depend either directly or indirectly from amended independent claims 5, 11, and 17, respectively, and include all the features of claims 5, 11, and 17, respectively, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 6-7, 12-13, and 18-19 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

None of the prior art cited by the Examiner discusses or suggests:

a unit accepting from the request apparatus a search request for searching the position of the search object, wherein a search range, within which the position of the search object is requested, is determined as a search range in which the request apparatus is centered;

and

a unit calculating only a distance between the measuring apparatus and the search object,

as recited in amended claim 20. Therefore, claim 20 patentably distinguishes over the cited

prior art. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

Claims 1-20 are pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 10-3-07

By:   
Aaron C. Walker  
Registration No. 59,921

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501